



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/581,180	07/14/2000	HIROTOSHI ISHIDA	192697US0PCT	1244

22850 7590 06/16/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WONG, LESLIE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1761

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/581,180	Applicant(s) Ishida et al.
Examiner Leslie Wong	Art Unit 1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on March 26, 2003 and May 8, 2003
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- 4) Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Dreftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1761

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muhammad et al for the reasons set forth in rejecting the claims in the last Office action (Paper No. 23).

Muhammad et al disclose a sweetener composition comprising aspartame and acesulfame K in the percents claimed.

The claims appear to differ as to the specific particle size.

In the absence of a showing to the contrary, the particle size is seen to be no more than obvious to that of Muhammad et al as the same components are utilized, and particle size is a matter of choice and well-within the skill of the art. At most the particle size is seen to be no more than optimization, see In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the claimed particle size because the choice is well-within the skill of the art and dictated by the final product desired.

Granulated table top sweeteners are notoriously well-known and conventional in the art. The form of delivery (e.g. granulated, liquid, etc) is merely a matter of choice and well-within the skill of the art.

Art Unit: 1761

In the absence of a showing to the contrary, the dissolution rate is seen to be no more than obvious to that of Muhammad et al as the same components are utilized.

With respect to claims 13-15, the recitation that the product is made by a new process, if the process were indeed new and patentable, does not render an otherwise unpatentable product new and patentable. It is pointed out that the claims are product claims and not process claims. The product must stand on its own invention, independently of the process of producing same. See In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 195; In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964; Ex parte Jungfer, 18 USPQ 2nd 1976.

Applicant's arguments filed March 26, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claimed invention provides unexpected results.

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed May 8, 2003 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-19 based upon Muhammad et al as set forth in the previous Office actions for the following reasons.

- 1) The showing is not commensurate in scope with the claims. Applicants broadest claim (i.e. claim 1) is not specifically directed to **granules of a mixture**. Also, claim 1 is not directed to dissolution rate.
- 2) Applicant does not provide statistical analysis of the data to support the conclusions.

Applicant states on page 6 of the response that “(e)ven assuming and *over-accessed* error as high as 10%, the conclusions drawn from the data are still clearly supported.” It is not clear what

Art Unit: 1761

Applicant intends by this argument. It is not clear whether Applicant is suggesting that the results differ from the prior art at a 90% confidence for the entire range. It is not clear whether unexpected results are obtained for the entire claimed range.

In the absence of unexpected results, it is not seen how the claimed invention differs from the teachings of the prior art. Applicant's claims are drawn to a combination of known components which produces expected results, see In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069 and In re Gershon 152 USPQ 602.

All of the claim limitations and arguments have been considered. None of them are seen as serving as basis for patentability.

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).


A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Art Unit: 1761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 308-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9310 for non-final responses and (703) 872-9311 for after-final responses.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Leslie Wong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1761

LAW
June 13, 2003